



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,093	02/17/2004	Bernard Auyang	011398.00005	4773
22908	7590	09/21/2005	EXAMINER	
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. TEN SOUTH WACKER DRIVE SUITE 3000 CHICAGO, IL 60606			BROWN, VERNAL U	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2635	

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/782,093

Applicant(s)

AUYANG ET AL.

Examiner

Vernal U. Brown

Art Unit

2635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31, 33 and 34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31, 33-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communication filed on June 27, 2005.

Response to Amendment

The examiner acknowledges the amendment of claims 17, 27, and the cancellation of claims 32 and 35.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/27/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's terminal disclosure filed 6/27/05 is not approved. The serial number reference to the application being ~~discarded~~ ^{disclaimed} is incorrect.

Regarding applicant's argument with respect to the control of plurality of remote devices, Teich et al. teaches the use of the remote control to control up to eight devices including the HVAC system and TVs manufactured by different manufacturer (col. 6 lines 12-20).

Regarding applicant's argument with respect to clock setup circuitry, alarm setup and activation circuitry and the programming of the remote control device, the alarm clock setup up circuitry and activation circuitry is conventionally used in a alarm clock. Teich teaches the use of alarm time set dial (figure 1) for setting the alarm time. The reference of Hesse is relied upon for teaching user-controllable microprocessor (16) for generating IR command signals for controlling various operating functions of the television receiver (col. 3 line 68-col. 4 line3).

Regarding applicant's argument regarding claim 11, the reference of Kutosky teaches a microprocessor coupled to the alarm module (figure 3) for programming of the alarm clock

Art Unit: 2635

representing an alternative to setting of the alarm time using the alarm time set dial (figure 1) of Teich invention for setting the alarm time.

Regarding claims 17 and 27, the reference of Lin et al. is relied upon for teaching a remote control coupled to a processor and the remote control is program to activate a particular device at a predetermine time using different timing circuit for different devices (col. 7 lines 61-69). The reference of Ladttke et al. is relied upon for teaching displaying the status of the remotely controlled device (col. 3 lines 17-30) in order to keep the user informed concerning the status of the controlled device.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 2635

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 6714136 of U.S. in view of Teich et al. US Patent No. 4850040.

Regarding claims 1 and 6, Auyang et al. (U.S Patent 6714136) in claims 1-4, claimed an alarm clock remote control system, comprising: alarm clock circuitry including: a microprocessor, coupled to alarm clock activation circuitry, remote IR diode driving circuitry, an internal buzzer, an alarm, a display, and a plurality of input ports and output ports, for providing central control; the display, coupled to the microprocessor, for displaying at least one of: a current time and an alarm time; a speaker, coupled to the microprocessor, an AM/FM radio unit, the internal buzzer, and the alarm, for outputting selected audio; an AM/FM radio tuner; and clock setup circuitry, alarm setup and activation circuitry coupled to the microprocessor for setting the clock, setting the alarm, and activating at least one remote device; and a programmable universal infrared remote device control, coupled to the alarm clock circuitry, for remote programming the at least one remote device, and having activation circuitry for activating the at least one remote device. Auyang et al. is however silent on claiming activating a plurality of remote device using the alarm clock remote control. Teich et al. in an art related remote control teaches the use of a remote control to control a plurality of devices (col. 1 lines 50-54, col. 6 lines 15-20) in order to simplify the control of a plurality of devices in a room by having one remote control to control all the electronic devices in a room.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the alarm clock remote control system to control a plurality of devices because Auyang et al. (U.S Patent 6714136)

Art Unit: 2635

claimed a remote control for controlling at least one device and Teich et al. teaches the use of a remote control to control a plurality of devices in order to simplify the control of a plurality of devices in a room by having one remote control to control all the electronic devices in a room.

Claim 11 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6714136 of U.S. in view of Teich et al. US Patent No. 4850040.

Regarding claim 11, Claims 1 and 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6714136 claimed a remote control alarm system, comprising: a microprocessor coupled to alarm activation circuitry, an alarm, a display, and a plurality of input ports and output ports, for providing central control; the display, coupled to the microprocessor, for displaying at least one of: a current time and an alarm time; a speaker, coupled to the microprocessor, for outputting selected audio. Auyang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6714136) is however silent on claiming a remote controller alarm triggering unit and the alarm setup and activation circuitry coupled to the remote controller alarm triggering unit for setting the alarm. One skilled in the art recognizes that the clock setup circuitry, alarm setup and activation circuitry coupled to the microprocessor as claimed in claim 1 is the functional equivalent to alarm triggering unit and the alarm setup and activation circuitry as claimed. Auyang et al. is also silent on claiming activating a plurality of remote device using the alarm clock remote control. Teich et al. in an art related remote control teaches the use of a remote control to control a plurality of devices (col. 1 lines 50-54, col. 6 lines 15-20) in order to simplify

Art Unit: 2635

the control of a plurality of devices in a room by having one remote control to control all the electronic devices in a room.

It would have been obvious to of ordinary skill in the art to have a remote controller alarm triggering unit and the alarm setup and activation circuitry coupled to the remote controller in Auyang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6714136) and use the alarm clock remote control system to control a plurality of devices because Auyang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6714136) claimed a remote control alarm system having clock setup circuitry, alarm setup and activation circuitry coupled to the microprocessor which is the functional equivalent to alarm triggering unit and the alarm setup and activation circuitry as claimed. Teich et al. teaches the use of a remote control to control a plurality of devices in order to simplify the control of a plurality of devices in a room by having one remote control to control all the electronic devices in a room.

Claims 2, 5, 7, 10 and 12 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent 6714136 in view of Teich et al. US Patent No. 4850040 and further in view of Kutosky U.S Patent 5995455.

Regarding claims 2, 7, and 12, Claims 1-4 of U.S Patent 6714136 claimed an alarm clock remote control but is silent on claiming the display is one of a light emitting diode and a LCD screen. Kutosky in an art related Alarm clock device teaches an alarm clock with a LCD display and also teaches a light emitting diode display is also suitable for the alarm clock (col. 6 lines 50-

Art Unit: 2635

54) and one skilled in the art recognize that LCD and LED displays are conventionally used on an alarm clock.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a LCD or light emitting diode display in an alarm clock in U.S Patent 6714136 as evidenced by Evans because U.S Patent 6714136 in view of Teich et al. claimed an alarm clock remote control and Kutosky teaches an alarm clock with a LCD display and also teaches a light emitting diode display is also suitable for the alarm clock and one skilled in the art recognize that LCD and LED displays are conventionally used on an alarm clock.

Regarding claims 5 and 10, Claim 1 of U.S Patent 6714136 claimed an alarm clock remote control but is silent on claiming the selected audio a buzzer output. Kutosky in an art related Alarm clock device teaches the audio is a buzzer output (col. 5 lines 12-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art have a buzzer output as the alarm signal in U.S Patent 6714136 as evidenced by Kutosky because U.S Patent 6714136 claimed an alarm clock and Kutosky teaches an alarm clock which has a buzzer output as the alarm signal and one skilled in the art recognizes that a buzzer output is a conventional alarm signal outputted from an alarm clock.

Claims 3-4, 8-9, and 13-16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent 6714136 in view of Teich et al. US Patent No. 4850040 and further in view of Hayes et al. U.S Patent 6223348.

Regarding claims 3-4, 8-9, and 13-16, Claims 1-4 of U.S Patent 6714136 claimed an alarm clock remote control but is silent on claiming the remote device is one of a plurality of remote devices controllable by the alarm clock remote control system and the plurality of remote devices includes at least one of: a television. Hayes et al. in an art related universal remote control system teaches a remote used for controlling a plurality of remote devices including a television (col. 5 lines 18-31) so as to eliminate the need to have a remote control for each remote device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to claim a plurality of remote devices controllable by the alarm clock remote control system and the plurality of remote devices includes at least one of a television in U.S Patent 6714136 in view of Teich et al. as evidenced by Hayes et al. because U.S Patent 6714136 claimed an alarm clock remote control and Hayes teaches a remote used for controlling a plurality of remote devices including a television so as to eliminate the need to have a remote control for each remote device.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teich et al. U.S Patent 4850040 in view of Hesse U.S Patent 5287109.

Regarding claim 1, Teich et al. teaches an alarm clock (figure 1) remote control system (col. 1 lines 55-57), comprising:

remote IR diode driving circuitry (figure 4), plurality of input ports and output ports such as radio control knob, key card slot and various control buttons for providing central control and a display (figure 1);

Art Unit: 2635

the control unit in figure 1 further includes a AM/FM radio which inherently includes speaker. Teich et al. also teaches clock/Alarm set control function (figure 1) and programmable universal infrared remote device control for remote programming at least one remote device, and having activation circuitry for activating the at least one remote device (col. 6 lines 12-20). Teich et al. is however silent on teaching a microprocessor coupled to the alarm and clock circuitry. Hesse in an art related Programmable Remote Control invention teaches user-controllable microprocessor (16) for generating IR command signals for controlling various operating functions of the television receiver (col. 3 line 68-col. 4 line3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a microprocessor coupled to the alarm clock circuitry in Teich et al. because Teich et al. suggests a remote control with alarm circuitry and programmable features and Hesse teaches a remote control having a clock circuitry coupled to a microprocessor for generating IR command signals for controlling various operating functions of the television receiver.

Regarding claims 2 and 7, Teich et al. teaches a light emitting diode display (figure 1).

Regarding claims 3 and 8, teaches the remote device is one a plurality remote devices controllable by the alarm clock (col. 6 lines 12-20).

Regarding claims 4 and 9, Teich et al. teaches the codes store in the alarm clock remote is used to control a television (col. 8 lines 10-11).

Regarding claims 5 and 10, Teich et al. teaches an alarm clock remote control system (figure 1) having AM/FM radio but is not explicit in teaching the selected audio is at least one of a ringing alarm, a buzzer output, and output of the AM/FM radio. One skilled in the art

Art Unit: 2635

recognizes that a ringing alarm, a buzzer output, and output of the AM/FM radio are conventional alarm audio signal output from an alarm clock.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the selected audio to be at least one of a ringing alarm, a buzzer output, and output of the AM/FM radio in Teich et al. because Teich et al. suggests an alarm clock remote control system having a AM/FM radio and one skilled in the art recognizes that a ringing alarm, a buzzer output, and output of the AM/FM radio are conventional alarm audio signal output from an alarm clock.

Regarding claim 6, Teich et al. teaches an alarm clock (figure 1) remote control system (col. 1 lines 55-57), comprising:

remote IR diode driving circuitry (figure 4), plurality of input ports and output ports such as radio control knob, key card slot and various control buttons for providing central control and a display (figure 1);

the control unit in figure 1 further includes a AM/FM radio which inherently includes speaker.

Teich et al. also teaches clock/Alarm set control function (figure 1) and programmable universal infrared remote device control for remote programming at least one remote device, and having activation circuitry for activating the at least one remote device (col. 6 lines 12-20). Teich et al.

is however silent on teaching a microprocessor coupled to the alarm and clock circuitry. Hesse in an art related Programmable Remote Control invention teaches user-controllable microprocessor (16) for generating IR command signals for controlling various operating functions of the television receiver (col. 3 line 68-col. 4 line3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a microprocessor coupled to the alarm clock circuitry in Teich et al. because Teich et al. suggests a remote control with alarm circuitry and programmable features and Hesse teaches a remote control having a clock circuitry coupled to a microprocessor for generating IR command signals for controlling various operating functions of the television receiver.

Claims 11-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teich et al. U.S Patent 4850040 in view of Kutosky US Patent 5995455 and further in view of Lin et al. US Patent 6633281.

Regarding claims 11 and 16-18, Teich et al. teaches an alarm clock (figure 1) remote control system (col. 1 lines 55-57), comprising :

- a display for displaying at least a current time and alarm time (figure 1);

- a timing module (U2) that maintain the current time;

- a programmable universal remote control module that transmits wireless control signal to at least one remote device when instructed (col. 6 lines 12-20). The transmitting of a control signal to a remote device suggests a setting up the remote device to function according to the user's preference, the setup mode is therefore control by the remote controller as taught by Teich. Teich et al. inherently teaches an internal alarm module that that alerts the user because Teich et al. teaches a snooze button (figure 1) which is used for deactivating the alarm. Teich et al is however silent on teaching a processor module that is coupled to the internal alarm module, the timing module, and the programmable universal remote control module and that is

Art Unit: 2635

configured to perform when the alarm function is on and the current time approximately equals a first predetermined remote alarm time, instructing the programmable universal remote control module to transmit a first wireless signal to a first remote device, wherein the first wireless signal activates the first remote device. Lin et al. in an art related universal remote control device teaches a remote control coupled to a processor and the remote control is program to activate a particular device at a predetermine time using different timing circuit for different devices (col. 7 lines 61-69). Teich et al. in view of Lin et al. is silent on teaching the coupling of the alarm module to a microprocessor. Kutosky in an art related alarm clock device invention teaches a microprocessor coupled to the alarm module (figure 3) for programming of the alarm clock.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a processor module that is coupled to the internal alarm module and the programmable remote control transmits a first wireless signal when current time approximately equals a first predetermined remote alarm time in Teich et al. as evidenced by Lin et al. in view of Kutosky because Teich et al. suggests an alarm clock remote control system and Lin et al. teaches a remote control coupled to a processor and the remote control is program to activate a particular device at a predetermine time. Kutosky further teaches a microprocessor coupled to the alarm module for programming of the alarm clock.

Regarding claim 12, Teich et al. teaches a light emitting diode display (figure 1).

Regarding claim 13, Teich et al. teaches the codes store in the alarm clock remote is used to control a television (col. 8 lines 10-11).

Art Unit: 2635

Regarding claims 14-15, Teich et al. teaches the alarm clock remote control having a plurality of input (room controls) (figure 1) and the alarm clock remote control is program to control at least one remote device by a user pressing at least one of the keys (col. 3 line 65-col. 4 line 15).

Regarding claim 19, Teich et al. teaches identifying the first remote device from a stored first value by decoding a value in order to identify the device to be control (col. 6 lines 12-20).

Regarding claims 20-22, Teich et al. teaches an input module that include a plurality of input element (alarm set button, snooze button shown in figure 1) and various input button for controlling the room appliances (col. 6 lines 14-20) but is silent on teaching a processor module configure to receive an internal alarm indicator corresponding to the user selection and storing the user select alarm time. Kutosky teaches an alarm clock with the alarm circuitry (150) coupled to the microprocessor (120) and the user inputting an alarm time (col. 5 lines 19-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a processor module configure to receive an internal alarm indicator corresponding to the user selection and storing the user select alarm time in Teich et al. in view of Lin et al. as evidenced by Kutosky because Teich et al. in view of Lin et al. suggests a plurality of input element for inputting alarm time to the alarm clock remote control and Kutosky teaches an alarm clock with the alarm circuitry coupled to the microprocessor and the user inputting an alarm time in order to control the operation of alarm clock.

Regarding claim 23, Teich et al. teaches an alarm clock (figure 1) remote control system (col. 1 lines 55-57) but is silent on teaching the processor module is configured so that when the

Art Unit: 2635

current time approximately equals a first sleep remote time, instructing the programmable universal remote control module: to transmit a corresponding; wireless signal to the first remote device, the corresponding wireless signal deactivating the first remote device. Lin et al. in an art related universal remote control device teaches a remote control coupled to a processor and the remote control is program to control a particular device at a predetermine time using a timer circuit (col. 7 lines 61-69). One skilled in the art recognizes that the powering down or deactivating of a remote device represents a standard control code function of a remote control code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the processor module is configured so that when the current time approximately equals a first sleep remote time, instructing the programmable universal remote control module: to transmit a corresponding; wireless signal to the first remote device, the corresponding wireless signal deactivating the first remote device in Teich et al. as evidenced by Lin et al. because Teich et al. suggests an alarm clock remote control system for controlling various devices and Lin et al. teaches a remote control coupled to a processor and the remote control is program to control a particular device at a predetermine time using a timer circuit . One skilled in the art recognizes that the powering down or deactivating of a remote device represents a standard control code function of a remote control code and therefore rendering it obvious to transmit control codes to deactivate a remote device.

Regarding claim 24, Teich et al. in view of Lin et al. teaches transmitting infrared control signal (col. 5 lines 27-28).

Art Unit: 2635

Regarding claim 25, Teich et al. in view of Lin et al. teaches an alarm clock with radio (figure 1) but is not explicit in teaching alarm module comprises: a radio module that provides a selected radio channel when the radio module is activated; and an audio alarm module that generates a repetitive sound when the audio alarm module is activated. Kutosky in an art related alarm device invention teaches a radio module that provides a selected radio channel when the radio module is activated; and an audio alarm module that generates a repetitive sound when the audio alarm module is activated (col. 7 lines 24-30) for alerting the user.

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to a radio module that provides a selected radio channel when the radio module is activated; and an audio alarm module that generates a repetitive sound when the audio alarm module is activated in Teich et al. as evidenced by Kutosky because Teich et al. in view of Lin et al. suggests an alarm clock remote control with radio function and Kutosky teaches a radio module that provides a selected radio channel when the radio module is activated; and an audio alarm module that generates a repetitive sound when the audio alarm module is activated for alerting the user.

Regarding claim 26, Teich et al. teaches a light emitting diode display (figure 1).

Claims 27-31 and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teich et al. U.S Patent 4850040 in view of Kutosky US Patent 5995455 in view of Lin et al. US Patent 6633281 and further in view of Ladtko et al. US Patent 6148241.

Regarding claims 27, and 29, Teich et al. teaches an alarm clock (figure 1) remote control system (col. 1 lines 55-57), comprising :

- a display for displaying at least a current time and alarm time (figure 1);

- a timing module (U2) that maintain the current time;

a programmable universal remote control module that transmits wireless control signal to at least one remote device when instructed (col. 6 lines 12-20). The transmitting of a control signal to a remote device suggests a setting up the remote device to function according to the user's preference, the setup mode is therefore control by the remote controller as taught by Teich. Teich et al. inherently teaches an internal alarm module that that alerts the user because Teich et al. teaches a snooze button (figure 1) which is used for deactivating the alarm. Teich et al is however silent on teaching a processor module that is coupled to the internal alarm module, the timing module, and the programmable universal remote control module and that is configured to perform when the alarm function is on and the current time approximately equals a first predetermined remote alarm time, instructing the programmable universal remote control module to transmit a first wireless signal to a first remote device, wherein the first wireless signal activates the first remote device. Lin et al. in an art related universal remote control device teaches a remote control coupled to a processor and the remote control is program to activate a particular device at a predetermine time using different timing circuit for different devices (col. 7 lines 61-69). Teich et al. in view of Lin et al. is silent on teaching the coupling of the alarm module to a microprocessor. Kutosky in an art related alarm clock device invention teaches a microprocessor coupled to the alarm module (figure 3) for programming of the alarm clock. Teich et al. in view of Kutosky in view of Lin et al. is however silent on teaching displaying a device status indicator that indicate each remote device being activated. Ludtke et al. in an art related control system teaches displaying the status of the remotely controlled device (col. 3 lines 17-30) in order to keep the user informed concerning the status of the controlled device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a processor module that is coupled to the internal alarm module and the programmable remote control transmits a first wireless signal when current time approximately equals a first predetermined remote alarm time in Teich et al. as evidenced by Lin et al. in view of Kutosky because Teich et al. suggests an alarm clock remote control system and Lin et al. teaches a remote control coupled to a processor and the remote control is program to activate a particular device at a predetermine time. Kutosky further teaches a microprocessor coupled to the alarm module for programming of the alarm clock. Ludtke et al. teaches displaying the status of the remotely controlled device in order to keep the user informed concerning the status of the controlled device.

Regarding claim 28, Teich et al teaches the controlled device is a television (col. 8 lines 10-11).

Regarding claim 30, Teich et al. teaches an alarm clock (figure 1) remote control system (col. 1 lines 55-57) but is silent on teaching the processor module is configured so that when the current time approximately equals a first sleep remote time, instructing the programmable universal remote control module: to transmit a corresponding; wireless signal to the first remote device, the corresponding wireless signal deactivating the first remote device. Lin et al. in an art related universal remote control device teaches a remote control coupled to a processor and the remote control is program to control a particular device at a predetermine time using a timer circuit (col. 7 lines 61-69). One skilled in the art recognizes that the powering down or

Art Unit: 2635

deactivating of a remote device represents a standard control code function of a remote control code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the processor module is configured so that when the current time approximately equals a first sleep remote time, instructing the programmable universal remote control module: to transmit a corresponding; wireless signal to the first remote device, the corresponding wireless signal deactivating the first remote device in Teich et al. as evidenced by Lin et al. because Teich et al. suggests an alarm clock remote control system for controlling various devices and Lin et al. teaches a remote control coupled to a processor and the remote control is program to control a particular device at a predetermine time using a timer circuit . One skilled in the art recognizes that the powering down or deactivating of a remote device represents a standard control code function of a remote control code and therefore rendering it obvious to transmit control codes to deactivate a remote device.

Regarding claim 31, Teich et al. teaches an input module that include a plurality of input element (alarm set button, snooze button shown in figure 1) and various input button for controlling the room appliances (col. 6 lines 14-20) but is silent on teaching a processor module configure to receive an internal alarm indicator corresponding to the user selection and storing the user select alarm time. Kutosky teaches an alarm clock with the alarm circuitry (150) coupled to the microprocessor (120) and the user inputting an alarm time (col. 5 lines 19-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a processor module configure to receive an internal alarm indicator corresponding to the user selection and storing the user select alarm time in Teich et al. in view of Lin et al. as evidenced by Kutosky because

Art Unit: 2635

Teich et al. in view of Lin et al. suggests a plurality of input element for inputting alarm time to the alarm clock remote control and Kutosky teaches an alarm clock with the alarm circuitry coupled to the microprocessor and the user inputting an alarm time in order to control the operation of alarm clock.

Regarding claim 33, Teich et al. teaches an alarm clock (figure 1) remote control system (col. 1 lines 55-57) but is silent on teaching the processor module is configured so that when the current time approximately equals a first sleep remote time, instructing the programmable universal remote control module: to transmit a corresponding; wireless signal to the first remote device, the corresponding wireless signal deactivating the first remote device. Lin et al. in an art related universal remote control device teaches a remote control coupled to a processor and the remote control is program to control a particular device at a predetermine time using a timer circuit (col. 7 lines 61-69). One skilled in the art recognizes that the powering down or deactivating of a remote device represents a standard control code function of a remote control code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the processor module is configured so that when the current time approximately equals a first sleep remote time, instructing the programmable universal remote control module: to transmit a corresponding; wireless signal to the first remote device, the corresponding wireless signal deactivating the first remote device in Teich et al. as evidenced by Lin et al. because Teich et al. suggests an alarm clock remote control system for controlling various devices and Lin et al. teaches a remote control coupled to a processor and the remote control is program to control a particular device at a predetermine time using a timer circuit . One skilled in the art recognizes that the powering

Art Unit: 2635

down or deactivating of a remote device represents a standard control code function of a remote control code and therefore rendering it obvious to transmit control codes to deactivate a remote device.

Regarding claim 34, Teich et al. teaches identifying the first remote device from a stored first value by decoding a value in order to identify the device to be control (col. 6 lines 12-20).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2635

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vernal U. Brown whose telephone number is 571-272-3060. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-7:00 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Horabik can be reached on 571-272-3068. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Vernal Brown
September 12, 2005


BRIAN ZIMMERMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER